

II. Claims 10-16, drawn to a manufacturing line for manufacturing an organic EL display, classified in class 313, subclass 505.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the two designated groups have not acquired a separate status in the art, notwithstanding possible different classifications which may be artificially assigned. Applicants note, for example, that the printing unit as recited in current Claim 1 is also recited as the second printing unit of the manufacturing line as currently recited in Claim 14. Thus, art very relevant to the patentability of the Group I claims might very logically be found in the art class assigned by the Examiner to Group II. Likewise, art very relevant to the patentability of the Group II claims might easily be found in the classification assigned by the Examiner to the Group I claims. Furthermore, art relating to the patentability of both groups of claims might easily be found within a number of additional art classifications.

In short, the classifications cited to support restriction are merely for cataloging purposes and are not conclusive of the propriety of restriction. It is submitted that the claims of the two groups designated by the Examiner are closely inter-related and in order to preserve unity of invention, both groups should be prosecuted in the same application. An important advantage in pursuing just one application is that the examination work of the Patent Office would thereby be simplified in as much as duplication of searching effort would be eliminated. Thus, restricting the application as suggested by the Examiner would increase searching effort rather than reduce it. Accordingly, search and examination can be made without serious burden, and, therefore, the Examiner must examine this application on the merits, even if the claims

are independent and distinct (MPEP 803).

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw this requirement for restriction and allow the claims of Group I (Claims 1 - 9) to be prosecuted in the same application as the claims of Group II (Claims 10 - 16). In the event that the Examiner's restriction requirement is made final, Applicants provisionally elect the claims of Group I (Claims 1 - 9) for continued prosecution, holding the claims of Group II (Claims 10 - 16) in abeyance under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.142(b) until final disposition of the elected claims.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 21 JULY 2005

By: 
Michael E. Hilton
Reg. No. 33,509

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MEH/pvd